

**REMARKS**

Claims 27-37, 45, 46, 49, 51 and 53-60 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 27 is amended, and claims 59 and 60 are added. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Nguyen at the personal interview held November 17, 2005, and the telephone interview held December 14, 2005, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

**I. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Office Action's indication that claim 45 contains allowable subject matter.

**II. Claim 27 Satisfies the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph**

The Office Action rejects claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that claim 27 does not show how the second image signals are generated based on the first image signals. By this Amendment, claim 27 is amended to recite "second image signals that are generated by digital to analog conversions of the first image signals being supplied to one data line of the plurality of data lines." Thus, as agreed upon during the telephone interview, claim 27 satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**III. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

**A. Rejection of Claims 27-31, 35, 37, 46, 49, 51, 53 and 58**

The Office Action rejects claims 27-31, 35, 37, 46, 49, 51, 53 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,815,136 to Ikeda et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,339,417 to Quanrud. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 27-31, 35, 37, 46, 49, 51, 53 and 58 would not have been rendered obvious by Ikeda in view of Quanrud. As agreed upon during the personal interview, none of the applied references teach or suggest "each of the plurality of memory cell groups storing first image

signals supplied through the selection switch section, and second image signals that are generated by digital to analog conversions of the first image signals being supplied to one data line of the plurality of data lines," as recited in claim 27.

Thus, claim 27 is patentable over Ikeda and Quanrud. Further, claims 28-31, 35, 37, 46, 49, 51, 53 and 58, which depend from claim 27, are also patentable over Ikeda and Quanrud, for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**B. Rejection of Claims 33, 34 and 36**

The Office Action rejects claims 33, 34 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ikeda in view of Quanrud and U.S. Patent No. 5,440,718 to Kumagai et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 33, 34 and 36 would not have been rendered obvious by Ikeda in view of Quanrud and Kumagai. Kumagai does not remedy the deficiencies of Ikeda and Quanrud discussed with respect to claim 27. Kumagai is only cited by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of a plurality of memory cell sections being configured by a dynamic memory. Claims 33, 34 and 36 depend from claim 27. Thus, claims 33, 34 and 36 are patentable over Ikeda, Quanrud, and Kumagai for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 27, as well as the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**C. Rejection of Claims 32 and 54-57**

The Office Action rejects claims 32 and 54-57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ikeda in view of Quanrud and U.S. Patent No. 6,049,321 to Sasaki. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 32 and 54-57 would not have been rendered obvious by Ikeda in view of Quanrud and Sasaki. Sasaki does not remedy the deficiencies of Ikeda and Quanrud discussed with respect to claim 27. Sasaki is only cited by the Office Action for its alleged

teaching of a DAC section. Claims 32 and 54-57 depend from claim 27. Thus, claims 32 and 54-57 are patentable over Ikeda, Quanrud and Sasaki for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 27, as well as the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs  
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hs

Date: December 30, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--